DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 252 CS 512 476

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Hager, Lori |
| TITLE | Who Owns the Glass Slipper? Transformation Ideology in Community Drama with Youth. |
| PUB DATE | 2003-02-00 |
| NOTE | 22p.; Paper presented at the Arizona State University Department of Theater's "What Is 'Cinderella' Hiding? Theatre/Ideology/Young People" Research Symposium (Tempe, AZ, February 20-22, 2003). |
| AVAILABLE FROM | For full text: http://theatre.asu.edu/symposium/ Hager.doc. |
| PUB TYPE | Information Analyses (070) -- Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *After School Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Government; *Financial Support; Public Policy; *Theater Arts; *Youth Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | Artists in Schools Program; Cinderella; *Drama in Education; Historical Background; National Endowment for the Arts; Transformative Education |

ABSTRACT

Community Drama with Youth is an as yet marginalized practice in the larger drama education field. Yet Community Drama with Youth, and other community youth arts, are fueling a burgeoning after-school youth arts movement. This paper considers federal policies which have shaped youth arts in the last several decades, and the ways in which these have constructed an ideological base out of which youth arts is practiced, researched, and theorized. According to the paper, the ways in which the arts community responds to the "barometer" effect, which depends on the political and economic climate, affects the ways in which youth arts are funded. The paper uses the metaphor of Cinderella as an opportunity to present some of the policies and ideologies that drive federal youth arts funding. It reads the metaphor of Cinderella as a story of transformation, where Cinderella, through magic and the glass slipper, transforms from lower class to upper class. The paper states that "transformation" is an ideology that has pervaded the ways in which the field of youth drama has constructed itself. It notes that from the Settlement House Movement use of drama to assimilate and Americanize marginal populations, to contemporary youth arts programs that seek to transform "at-risk" youth, transformation exists as a driving agenda. The paper concludes that, in this particular reading of the Cinderella metaphor, the one who held onto the glass slipper had the power--ideology and politics of the arts field need to be owned by the artists and practitioners. (Contains 26 references.) (NKA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

# Who owns the glass slipper?
# Transformation Ideology in Community Drama with Youth.

By Lori Hager

ED 480 252

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Hager

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS512476



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lori Hager

Paper Submission for "What is Cinderella Hiding? Theatre and Drama/Ideology/Young People" research symposium

January 10, 2003

*Who owns the glass slipper?*

*Transformation Ideology in Community Drama with Youth*.

Community Drama with Youth is an as yet marginalized practice in the larger drama education field. Yet Community Drama with Youth, and other community youth arts, are fueling a burgeoning after-school youth arts movement. In this paper I will consider federal policies which have shaped youth arts in the last several decades, and the ways in which these have constructed an ideological base out of which youth arts is practiced, researched, and theorized.

Changing positions of youth arts in federal policy function almost as a barometer of the political and economic climate. The ways in which the arts community responds, or is even aware of this "barometer," affects the ways that youth arts are positioned ideologically and socially, and ultimately affects the ways in which youth arts are funded. As artists, we tend to ignore the political environment out of which funding happens, preferring instead to focus on arts goals and the pragmatics of getting programs up and running. But as long as we remain in relative ignorance of these forces, we will continue to be powerless to affect them, and to guide the ways in which youth arts are funded and positioned nationally.

In this paper, I use the metaphor of Cinderella as an opportunity to present some of the policies and ideologies that drive federal youth arts funding. I read the metaphor of Cinderella as a story of transformation, where Cinderella--through magic and the glass slipper--transforms from lower class to upper class. Transformation is an ideology that has pervaded the ways in which the field of youth drama has constructed itself. From the Settlement House Movement use of drama to assimilate and Americanize marginal populations, to contemporary youth arts programs that seek to transform "at-risk" youth, transformation exists as a driving agenda.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Federal arts funding policy has been able to make use of this transformation ideology to position youth arts in service to various federal and national agendas. This year, the NEA has implemented one of the most wide-ranging restructuring of its youth arts programs since its inception in 1965. This year arts education was included as a core academic requirement in "No Child Left Behind", the 2001 Education Act--a position arts communities had been advocating for years. A Master of Arts Management degree in Youth and Community Development was announced at Columbia College--the first academic program specifically in youth and community development. After-school and nonschool-based youth arts programs are increasing dramatically, and receiving support from federal programs, national funding, and local initiatives. In addition to federal recognition through funding support, after-school arts are increasingly the subject of arts-based research as well as social science research. The recent report, Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development, is widely hailed as a major effort toward providing the "hard evidence" in support of the arts in education. In addition to showing links in arts learning and academic achievement, Critical Links presents research in support of the arts and social development in after-school community programs (Brice-Heath, Mahoney). At the spring 2002 Americans for the Arts conference, this trend was named a "youth arts movement." After-school youth arts is gaining momentum, transforming public perceptions and changing the ways in which arts education with youth is defined and practiced.

Research and policies that drive NEA programs, drive local programs' design as well. This, in turn, shapes the nature of the drama encounter between youth and artist-teachers, and affects the ways in which drama with youth is practiced and defined. After-school drama programs with youth are shaped in response to perceived needs (such as filling after-school hours, introducing arts programming to city recreation programs, answering calls for assistance in using the arts with youth in various social service agencies such as the Department of Justice, and Housing and Urban Development). Once the programs are shaped, funding is sought. In this cycle of program design and funding, projects are frequently structured in response to funding initiatives as a way of bringing important resources to teachers, artists, and community youth. NEA policy and programs largely shape public funding programs. This, in turn, determines the course of national

arts education and youth arts research.

This year, NEA arts education programs were restructured under a new Program Category called Arts Learning. Arts Learning divides arts education and youth arts programs into three areas: Early Childhood, School-based, and, Community-based. ("Arts Learning" 1-2). Community-based projects partner nonarts organizations with artists and arts organizations. This year marks the first time the NEA has formally recognized community arts as a component of youth arts. Arts Learning supports nonschool arts programs with youth in recognition "that learning activities occur outside the regular school day and year, in school facilities or elsewhere in the community, as well as in schools during the school day" ("Outcomes-Based" 2). Another change in the NEA youth arts programming this year is outcomes-based evaluation requirements. In compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act, federal agencies are "required to collect information on the applications it receives and the projects it funds in order to report to Congress and the public" ("Arts Learning" 4). Current grant recipients must provide evidence of outcomes measures, a trend which will increase research efforts in this area.

With the new Education Act, community-based organizations may now apply for funding for programs housed in community organizations as well as schools through the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. CCLC-supported programs include the arts, extending learning for young people after school hours. "Since the inception of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program, federal funding for school-based, out-of-school-time programs has grown from $40 million in 1998 to $450 million this year" (WestEd 9). It is large funding programs such as CCLC, and research such as represented in Critical Links, fueling the contemporary youth arts movement and national "out-of-school-time" programs.

After-school education, enrichment, and recreation programs are picking up where failing schools and communities are leaving off. First Lady Hillary Clinton in 1994 said, "it takes a village," and after-school community programs are increasingly becoming a part of this "village." Clinton called for the creation of "Safe Havens" for young people and asked the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities (PCAH) to "explore ways to enhance the availability of the arts and the humanities to children,

specially to those at risk" (Weitz 6). In response, the President's Committee created the Coming Up Taller Awards, which annually awards $10,000 to after-school neighborhood programs peer reviewers deem exceptional in their capacity to reach "at-risk" young people through the arts. The NEA, in partnership with Housing and Urban Development and the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts, initiated "Creative Communities" a Challenge America Leadership Initiative, to "strengthen families, communities, and our nation through the arts" (Creative Communities - FY 2001 3). This program funded free sequential arts instruction by professional artist-teachers in HUD communities, specifically for the purpose of creating "safe havens for children and youth in public housing" (Creative Communities - FY 2001 4). The Youth Arts Development Project linked juvenile justice programs with after-school and summer arts programs. This project created model arts programs for youth "at-risk." Though the arts community has long advocated for the role of the arts in helping "at-risk" youth, the Youth Arts Development Project was the first that provided solid research documenting positive results.

In environments where the arts are subsumed to the "more important" funding for science and technology, job skill preparation, and social services, partnerships play an important role. Partnerships have been essential to NEA programs since the beginning, as in the arts education partnerships with the Office of Education and in job programs with the Department of Labor. Increasingly, it is these kinds of partnerships that generate funding--and therefore, programs--for community organizations as well as arts programmers.

It is important to the artistic viability and economic stability of arts education to consider ways in which after-school youth arts have became considered a part of the federal solution for social programs. This began clearly during the Carter administration in the late 1970s, and in the 1990s became increasingly clear. The 2002 NEA arts education re-structuring further extends formal recognition to the increasing roles of community partnerships between young people, arts programs, and civic and social organizations.

Arts programs with and for youth have been a part of the NEA since its establishment with the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. In its enabling legislation Congress found that:

- Americans should receive in school, background and preparation in the arts and humanities to enable them to recognize and appreciate the aesthetic dimensions of our lives, the diversity of excellence that comprises our cultural heritage, and artistic and Scholarly expression. (Number 9)
- To fulfill its educational mission, achieve an orderly continuation of free society and provide models of excellence to the American people, the Federal Government must transmit the achievement and values of civilization from the past via the present to the future, and make widely available the greatest achievements of art. (Number 11). (National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. 20 US Code Sec. 951. "Declaration of Findings.")

In this way, the government is mandated to include the arts in the schools, and in other forms of youth preparation and education. Arts are viewed as a means of transmitting cultural knowledge and civilization to the widest possible population.

Though formal and informal arts education was part of the NEA's access programs, arts education was generally understood to refer to arts in the schools and specifically to the early Artist-in-Schools programs. School based arts learning, and non-school based arts education with youth had separate trajectories informally, but these were neither explicit nor clear-cut. Most of the community based, or nonschool arts programs with youth, were funded through the Expansion Arts category that changed over time from a community arts support program to a minority support program. The current re-structuring of the NEA Arts Education programs represent a significant step in separating out-of-school arts learning from school-based youth arts. However, during the first thirty years of the NEA Arts Education efforts, the school-based arts education programs provided a rallying point for all youth arts education efforts, including programming, research and policy, and funding.

*NEA School Based Arts Education Programs*

From the start, the NEA worked with the U.S. Office of Education to sponsor programs in the schools in support of arts education. The NEA is authorized to enable partnerships with other federal and private agencies, artists, state, or "other public performing and non-performing arts and educational institution or organization, association, or museum in the United States" in order to "foster and encourage exceptional talent, public knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the arts" (1990 Annual Report 17). Activities supported included arts instruction and training for youth, teacher preparation, arts faculty resources, development of curriculum materials, and evaluation and assessment of programs and instruction. (1990 Annual Report 18). Specifically, the legislation called for cooperation between the Department of Education beginning with the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965, and more recently with the current Education Act of 2001, No Child Left Behind.

ESEA Title IV made funds available for research and development in arts education through the United States Office of Education's Arts and Humanities Program (AHP). This was the first time in the history of government legislation that a partnership between arts and education was initiated (Arts 219). Title IV provided for education research, Title III for innovative educational programs, and Title I for programs for disadvantaged children (Arts 219). The 1965 Act also supported and encouraged partnerships "between arts and education agencies at State and local levels, arts organizations, business colleges, and universities" (1990 Annual Report 18). In addition to supporting local arts councils and agencies, it supported partnerships between the other various branches of government including Department of Justice, and Housing and Urban Development. These departments have, as does the Office of Education, long-standing partnerships with the NEA which have been instrumental and influential in the program design and goals of youth arts at local levels. Prior to the ESEA, research in education was a low federal priority compared to research in the sciences and social sciences. Due to the 1965 ESEA, millions of dollars became available for research and development in education, which applied in part to arts education. This money amounted to "a shot in the arm for arts and humanities education in general, which began to

receive unprecedented support" (Murphy 2). Funds allowed arts researchers to broaden and deepen studies. Harvard's Project Zero was one research effort that benefited from this initial "infusion."

Title III of the ESEA encouraged schools and communities to work together in education, supporting arts education as part of these programs. Title III was mandated to ensure the "participation of persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served" (Eddy 162). Title III recognized the concept of learning centers beyond the classroom called "supplementary educational centers and services" that contributed to strengthening the interdependence of schools and communities (Eddy 162). Junius Eddy, who helped run the AHP, called Title III a "significant milestone" for the future of education and for educational alternatives such as the "schools without walls." He claimed that this small "modestly funded" part of the ESEA caused people to reflect:

> That education is, indeed, everybody's business; that schools are only one of the settings in which learning can take place; that the community itself is a potentially valuable environment for learning; and that many persons in the community, other than professional educators, can and should be enlisted as 'teachers' for certain kinds of learning experiences. (162)

*NEA Community Youth Arts - A Beginning*

One of the first community youth art projects undertaken by the NEA was the result of a 1966 proposal titled "The Smaller Community and the Rural Arts Project." Robert Gard, founder of the Wisconsin Idea Theatre and an influential figure in the grasroots theatre movement, set out to find out what people in small towns wanted from the arts. The report documented the project, which became a model for effective support of projects that helped engage populations in rural areas through outreach. He submitted a formal proposal to the NEA in 1966. NEA Deputy Chairman Christopher Mark saw the project as an opportunity for the NEA to extend its reach beyond "the current small minority of middle and upper middle class patrons" (Mark 118), and to create a program under which small community based, or grassroots organizations could apply:

> I was convinced that the future growth and solid foundation for cultural progress had to be formed from the grassroots activities of the general

> populace. As long as arts activities were enjoyed, supported, and controlled by the current small minority of middle and upper class patrons, our cultural life would be a sometime thing. If we truly believe the arts were essential to the human spirit, could make our lives fuller and richer, then we were obligated to try and bring them to the people who had been ignored until now. (Mark 118)

Another community arts project that influenced future community arts policy was developed in response to the riots which broke out in 1968 in response to the murder of Martin Luther King. Vice President Hubert Humphrey came up with a summer arts project for inner cities to help "combat violence" during the summer. (Mark 160). It was decided that 16 of the cities most likely to erupt in violence in the summer would be awarded grants of 25,000 for arts projects for young people characterized as "at-risk." Humphrey seized this opportunity to utilize the arts for political purposes. The summer arts program was launched by a conference to train the people who would be working with the project. Neophytes at planning inner city arts projects, the planners proposed to present symphony orchestras and take youth on field trips to the art museums (Mark 162). In a 1970 article for Public Administration Review, the program was described as:

> Kind of loosely organized exposure of poor youngsters (mainly nonwhite) to enriching experiences from the Western middle-class cultural tradition intended to compensate for presumed deprivation in their lives and backgrounds. One does not have to deny the true richness of the Western cultural tradition to point out the presumptuousness, arrogance, and racism inherent in this simplistic approach to the culturally different person in our pluralistic society. (Eddy in Mark 162)

Community arts programs continue to struggle with these issues. The 1970 article, "changed the attitude of many funding arts agencies, including the Endowment" (Mark 163). The summer arts program was a significant project and marks the first real effort by the federal agency to involve the arts directly in addressing the particular challenges of the inner city neighborhoods:

> First, until the 16-city program was undertaken, no federal agency had put its money squarely on the principle of direct involvement in the processes

> of the arts by young people in poverty neighborhoods [...] No funds mandated for this purpose, with few strings attached, and intended to support a multi-city program, had been forthcoming from any federal agency prior to this time. (Mark 163)

This was to change significantly during the ensuing administrations.

Expansion Arts was a NEA program designed to assist community organizations that were operating in areas considered "remote from traditional arts institutions" (Smith 413). The constituencies of the early Expansion Arts program were "ethnic and rural minorities whose cultures had been inadequately supported in the past" (Smith 413). Inner cities and rural areas, both of which had rarely enjoyed access to the arts, (as far as defined by federal support programs), were especially targeted. Expansion Arts was begun as the Endowment recognized the changing demographics in the country and wanted to bring these groups into the agency (Spellman). Community arts groups were asked to articulate the problems in the community that could be addressed by the arts. One issue that was identified was the value of the arts to community health. Expansion Arts was organized to advance established arts organizations, to solidify the organizations, and bring to them startup money through matching grants.

In 1969, when the war protests and the so-called counterculture movement were going strong, President Nixon asserted that "arts have the rare capacity to help heal divisions among our own people and to vault some of the barriers that divide the world" (Smith 416). The power of the arts to transcend and mitigate difference has been a powerful tool for arts proponents, and continues to guide arts policy formation.

Nancy Hanks was Chairman under Nixon and stimulated the beginnings of important youth arts programs in the Education and Expansion Arts Programs, which formed the core structure for arts programming with young people for the next decades. In 1969, the Office of Education transferred $100,000 to the NEA to be used in Artist-in-Schools program (which had begun with the 1966 NYC Poets in the Schools program), and then $900,000 in 1970. By 1974, the NEA allocated $4 million to the Artist-in-Schools program, with more than 2000 artists reaching 7500 schools: "The Artists-in-Schools program represents the single largest Arts Endowment program that has as its primary purpose--defined by policy, as opposed to legislation--the support of arts

education-related projects" (Arts 222). With Hanks, youth became an explicit focus of arts programming and social goals. Critics argued that siphoning money from individual artists to support organizations and youth put the "emphasis on welfare rather than quality" (Smith 69). However, it established a policy of extending partnerships with other federal programs in the interests of supporting national civic and economic goals, and was put solidly into effect during the Carter Administration.

NEA Chairman Livingston Biddle under President Carter was a populist who supported the concept that the arts "have an aesthetic and social value as the manifestation of the plurality of cultures making up American society" (Mulcahy 50), and it was this ideological position that drove much of the NEA policies and programs during the Carter years. In one sense, this concerned no less than a redefinition of what the arts were, and how they are defined across social classes and geographic areas. The "elitist/populist debate", by setting up oppositions which by their nature force people to take sides in an equation largely defined by its ability to serve political constituencies, challenges the notion that equitable arts policy can exist in a pluralistic society. Culture critic Robert Brustein said that with the appointment of Populist Biddle, the NEA shifted from support of serious art, to its dissemination (Brustein 70), and from support for the artist to support of the public. At the same time, he asserts, the budget reached a high enough mark to begin to concern Congress.

Biddle referred to Expansion Arts as a "minority" program for the first time since it began in 1971. Expansion Arts Director AB Spellman maintained that the program was geared "toward low and moderate income groups and to people living in rural communities, towns and inner city neighborhoods," stressing the importance of offering such groups the highest quality arts regardless of race. Biddle asserted that Expansion Arts existed to, "extend the boundaries of the arts world and to assure that no American will be denied the opportunity to reach his or her artistic potential because of geographic, economic, or other social or cultural restraints" (1978 Annual Report 11). Additionally, Biddle established a special assistant for minority affairs within the Office of the Chairman. He pledged to assist minority arts groups to secure funding in the discipline areas (which implies that Expansion Arts is a form of Affirmative Action or arts

welfare for the needy, i.e. minority), "and to strengthen those ethnic cultural institutions of proven excellence so they can attain financial independence and stability" (1978 Annual Report 12). He also pledged greater minority representation on the panels. Biddle defended his position on minority support; saying that it was difficult to ascertain how many grants went to minority groups because it was not one of the identifiers on the applications. In a footnote, the Annual Report makes a point of defining "minority", and defending its record in minority arts support and representation on the program panels, generally suggesting a defensive position in regards to "access."

Partnerships between the NEA and the Department of Housing and Urban Development helped to solidify the position of the arts in economic development. Economic Development in the arts during the Carter Administration found expression in programs designed to enhance cities and to encourage employment in the arts.

The first such project was a newly proposed "Livable Cities" program in partnership with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This project was authorized by Congress to be administered by HUD in cooperation with the NEA. Livable Cities was proposed to Congress as part of Carter's urban policy. It encouraged nonprofit groups to apply to HUD if their projects had, "substantial artistic, cultural, historical, or design merit", and if they represented "a significant potential for conserving or revitalizing communities or neighborhoods, and for enhancing community or neighborhood identity and pride" (1978 Year in Review 10). Projects would be doubled the second year from guidelines determined by both agencies and would be selected jointly by HUD and the NEA. About the program, Biddle declared:

> We know from past programs that the arts can galvanize a community, that they can provide a sudden surge of electricity, a symbol of communal pride or ethnic identity that can make a difference between success or failure of a community or neighborhood rehabilitation project. (1978 Annual Report 2)

The Carter Administration encouraged other federal agencies such as the Department of Labor, Department of Commerce, and Department of Education to "incorporate the arts in their efforts to effect social, environmental, and economic progress" (Wyszomirski 25). A 1978 Commerce Department report said that the arts

served to stimulate tourism, construction, and neighboring restaurants and businesses (Wyszomirski 24-25). This "commerce and tourism argument" became a potent advocacy tool for arts organizations and for arts participation in urban planning and growth. They argued that "the arts, in their broadest sense, can provide the bond that holds people and neighborhoods together" (Harney 7) and that the arts can improve community image, and increase the community's attractiveness to new residents and businesses.

In addition to linking the arts with the growth of cities, the NEA became linked with the Department of Labor during Carter's administration. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) put thousands of artists to work from the mid-1970s until Reagan de-funded it in 1982. Some likened the program to the Federal Theatre Project, and the work relief for artists in the 1930s (Morgan x). CETA was the first federally supported comprehensive program to employ artists since the FTP. It was funded through the U.S. Department of Labor to employ and train artists. CETA was designed to not only put out-of-work artists to work, but to benefit local arts agencies, and the city economies. "Cultural industry" skills were found to be "easily transferable to other occupational areas" (Morgan x), and proved the basis for the economic argument for the arts and has guided policy and initiatives such as the School-to-Work and other arts-related job preparation advocacy arguments and funding programs. CETA laid a foundation for the continuing investment in the arts and the "cultural worker" by connecting the arts to quality of life in cities and job training.

Many artist-in-school programs got their start in 1974-1978 because of CETA, and its artists employment incentive (Gibans 256). However, arts in the schools programs funded by CETA were criticized for their focus on employment and training, rather than the more important "research, planning, training and implementation of arts concurrently taking place in education programs," (Gibans 256)--which arts educators were lobbying for. The economic argument for support of the arts was linked with the larger issues of jobs and economy. The Carter administration used this to found a rationale for a policy that might otherwise have been difficult to support in a period of tight money and budgetary cutbacks (Wyszomirski 25).

> The Carter administration adopted the economic impact argument and used it to strengthen the economic arts relationship by portraying the arts

> as an industry that gave a very profitable return for the money invested therein. This perspective was further underlined by the creation of the post of Special Assistant for Cultural Resources in the Commerce Department as a tactic to 'legitimize' the validity of the economic impact argument and of the arts as industry. (Wyszomirski 25)

Expansion Arts was under the direction of A B Spellman in 1979 and was in its eighth year of programs. Expansion Arts is especially interesting to this study because, though it is not a designated education program, most of its projects involve the community and youth:

> One important shared trait was that many organizations which produced art also taught it. Other groups designed their projects for nontraditional audiences which until then had not had much to do with the arts. Many organizations did both. Thus, the largest Expansion Arts categories have been Instruction and Training and Arts Exposure. (1979 Annual Report 51)

Spellman articulated the types of projects that were funded under the Expansion Arts category: "While they [the arts organizations] have an intense pride in their art, they also realize its value in helping their communities. This outlook, combining as it does aesthetic and community-oriented concerns, remains the basis for these groups' relationship to our program" (1979 Annual Report 51). Expansion Arts recognized that it was "a point of entry for developing arts groups that are established in and reflect the culture of minority, blue collar, rural, and low-income communities" (1979 Annual Report 51), and this became part of its goals. The Expansion Arts mission fit well in Biddle's vision: "We hope to help preserve the cultural traditions of our communities as they are expressed in art, and to encourage the evolution of the art forms which will carry those traditions into the next century" (53).

Though the argument for the power of the arts in economic development, creating communities, job preparation, and crime prevention have been important ingredients in the advocates toolkit for generations, the 1996 budget reductions catalyzed arts and civic leaders to create a more formal platform for connections between youth arts outside of school hours and in social and civic programs. These principles have guided arts education policy in nonschool hours over the last six years, contributing to the emergence

of a "youth arts movement." Such policies fuel the establishment of new sources of revenue between community and arts organizations which make programming possible, drive research, and help to "professionalize" community youth arts practice.

In 1996 the NEA's annual budget was cut by 40% as a result of political pressure from right-wing conservatives in response to the so-called "NEA Four" controversies, precipitating a massive re-structuring unprecedented in the NEA. That year the NEA sponsored a series of forums across the nation designed to identify "the most pressing problem facing the arts today: in an era of dwindling public resources, how might community's best support the arts at a local level?" (Larson 6). These forums resulted in a panel report, American Canvas, written by arts policy analyst Gary Larson. Four topic areas guided the national forums that were conducted throughout 1996 in six cities across the country: the Artist and Society; Lifelong Learning in the Arts; Arts and Technology; and New Ideas for Federal Arts Funding. (Larson 8). Each state was given a series of questions for consideration, in order to explore successful integration of the arts into communities and help to "frame the course of action for improving the climate for culture in the 21st century" (14). The forums included representatives from arts communities, business and education, as well as representatives from social services and civic affairs. Curiously, none of the panelists self-identified as full time practicing professional artists.

The marginal role of arts organizations in the communities was a central theme in the report. One panelist suggested that what arts organizations have done successfully is cultivated "relationships with individuals of relative wealth (audiences and boards), dead individuals of wealth (foundations), and the business community" (Larson 78). Barriers between arts organizations and communities are "rooted in larger socio-economic factors," reported Larson, such as "poverty, segregation, and illiteracy", which "arts organizations alone are powerless to change" (79). Regardless, growing numbers of arts organizations are trying to change these factors by turning to a "variety of social service and community-outreach programs" in a monumental shift *"that has no precedent in American culture"* [author italics] (79).

By reaching out to social service and community programs, arts organizations both develop new audiences, and secure additional essential funding sources, "as a means of survival" (80), Larson reported. This reach coincides with an increasing push in private

giving for social justification in granting (80). Survival, however, does not preclude social activism. Like the arts activists of the 1930s and 1960s, the socially-minded artist in the 1990s was offered "plenty of targets", especially "as the public sector retreated from its erstwhile social responsibilities, leaving in tatters that 'safety net' that many Americans had once taken for granted" (81). Larson asserted that the "survival" argument for arts in social service did not preclude the "social activist" argument. However, panelists seemed to agree that the best chance "to rebuild broad based support for the arts and address the substantial social ills confronting our nation, is to recognize the arts have everything to do with daily life and with all people in every community in our nation" (Larson 80). Conversely, while recognizing the "sincerity of arts organizations that endeavor to contribute to the social welfare," Larson argued that, "there is also more than a trace of desperation--the recognition that ours is not a society that places a sufficiently high value on the arts to support them for their aesthetic contributions alone" (81).

This attitude was referred to as a "new pragmatism" on the part of arts communities, which accepts "the need to 'translate' the value of the arts into more general civic, social, and educational terms that will be more readily understood, by the general public, and by their elected officials" (81). Unfortunately, the necessity for such pragmatism reflects the disheartening reality that fewer people than ever experience the arts in their school years, which perpetuates this constant re-sifting of the value of the arts into practical terms which this, and the next, generation uneducated in the arts, can understand.

A startling statistic presented in the report is that 100 percent of the Local Arts Agencies (LAAs) in the 50 largest American cities "use the arts to address community development issues" (84). "Cultural/Racial Awareness" tops the list for LAA's community development issues, followed by "Youth at Risk," "Economic Development," "Crime Prevention," "Illiteracy," "Substance Abuse," and "Homelessness" among others (84). These statistics support the panel's assertion that community development reflects the "fastest growing program and service area of local arts agencies" (84). The report also shows that in order to participate in community development issues, LAA's work in tandem with other community organizations such as

schools, parks and recreation, social service departments, law enforcement, community organizations, and others (in Larson 85).

What does this signify for the position of arts in communities? Larson argued that:

> [Nor] can arts organizations afford to assume that in their new role as 'catalysts for change and renewal,' they'll be any more successful than the failed (and/or curtailed) public-sector social-service programs that saddled the arts--among other sectors--with the burden of becoming social problem-solvers in the first place. (89)

Programs that link that arts to solving social problems and "community development issues" are ideologically complex, raising the proud histories of the artists as social activists, albeit in a different and perhaps more fettered capacity. When the artist must mediate between the agendas of different social service and arts agencies, unanticipated and unprovoked crises will erupt--for which the artist may be untrained and unprepared. This creates a tenuous position for the arts, placing it in the center of opposing forces, and with no way to really "win." As long as the arts are in service to social welfare, artistic contributions will be preempted by the "more important" social considerations, which will repeatedly surface. However, to argue against the arts in service to social welfare opposes a socially conscious and politically responsible position for the arts. As we have seen in arts-in-education over the last 35 years, positioning the arts in service to another agenda rarely benefits the arts in the long-term. When social programs change, the arts will once again be stranded, left high and dry for the next tide, which will sweep the arts away again from its aesthetic purpose.

The panel argued that arts organizations which have been working (and so are experienced) in these areas should be well supported. However, organizations which must "twist themselves around now into some shape so that they can do that work--maybe not even very well--is self-defeating" (Larson 90). The impulse for organizations "caught up in the communitarian spirit" who turn to social work "as a means of staying afloat," are going to run into trouble, cautions one panelist (Larson 89). The panel cautioned arts organizations who attempt this, warning that by doing so, "We're putting

ourselves into a situation where we cannot succeed" (Larson 90). The irony of such a position for artists and arts organizations is inescapable when viewed in light of the impetus behind the American Canvas study: to strategize about creating an environment in which the legacy of American arts can survive and thrive. Positioning the arts in service to social welfare agendas leaves the purpose of the arts dependent upon the goals of the social service programs, while severely restricting the ability of the arts to leverage funds for artistic purposes. This does not promote a firm foundation for future funding of the arts. It does, however, support the lowest common denominator. By positioning the arts as fiscally desperate, some of the most important artistic values and outcomes are "dumbed down" to arts-poor white middle-class politicians and funders. Does this serve the arts community in the long term? :

> All of a sudden, as Ruby Lerner has expressed it, the arts are valuable if they can solve social problems, and of course, God knows we couldn't solve social problems in the social arena, but now it's expected that in the cultural arena we'll be able to solve all these problems--'and, by the way, we won't be able to give you many resources to do this.' (Larson 89)

Positions for youth arts in federal policy reflect the political and economic climate out of which the arts operate. This year's re-structuring of the NEA arts education programs into Arts Learning signifies a shift toward more formal recognition of the different challenges in community arts and arts in education, as well as increased reliance on research and outcomes measures in both. Research will be conducted by policy experts and arts researchers, and this research will drive policy and funding thus affecting the ways that local programs are designed and implemented. All of this has tremendous ramifications for the TYA profession. Research generated within the arts field has less impact on policy than research conducted by social scientists affiliated with policy research institutes such as the Urban Institute or the Morrison Institute. This means that artists are rarely included in national and federal level dialogues that set policy agendas for the arts practice, as was the case with American Canvas. In order for this to change, artists must pay attention to these somewhat foreign political and economic processes and insist in inclusion. In the title of this paper I asked, Who owns the glass slipper? In my

reading of the Cinderella metaphor, the one who held onto the glass slipper had the power. Ideology and politics of the arts field need to be owned by the artists and practitioners. Or, we can choose to remain the tatty stepsister.

Works Cited

Arts, Education, and Americans Panel. Coming to our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

"Arts Learning: Overview." Arts Learning: Overview 6 September 2002 <http://222.arts.gove/guide/ArtsLearning03/overview.html>.

Brice Heath, Shirley. "Living the Arts Through Language and Learning: A Report on Community-Based Youth Organizations." Ed. Richard Deasy. Critical Links.Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership, 2002. 78-79.

---, and Laura Smyth. ArtShow: Youth and Community Development. Washington, DC: Partners for Livable Communities, 1999.

Brustein, Robert. Cultural Calisthenics: Writings on Race, Politics, and Theatre. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1998.

Deasy, Richard. Ed. Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership, 2002.

Eddy, Junius. "Beyond 'Enrichment': Developing a Comprehensive Community-School Arts Curriculum." Arts and the Schools. Jerome Hausman, ed. NY: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Gibans, Nina Freedlander. The Community Arts Council Movement: History, Opinion, Issues. NY: Praeger, 1982.

Harney, Andy Leon. The City and the Arts: A Civic Handbook of Grants Programs Offered by the National Endowment for the Arts. Washington, DC: Partners for Livable Places, 1980.

Larson, Gary O. American Canvas. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1996. (available in PDF from http://arts.endow.gov)

Mahoney, Joseph and Robert B.Cairns. "Do Extracurricular Activities Protect Against Early School Dropout?" Ed. Richard Deasy. Critical Links.Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership, 2002. 78-79.

Mark, Charles Christopher. Reluctant Bureaucrats: The Struggle to Establish the National Endowment for the Arts. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendal/Hunt, 1991.

Morgan Management Systems, Inc. CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) and the Arts and Humanities: Fifteen Case Studies. Springfield, VA: U.S. Department of Commerce National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 1981.

Mulcahy, Kevin and C. Richard Swaim. Public Policy and the Arts. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1982.

Murphy, Judith and Lonna Jones. Research in Arts Education: A Federal Chapter. U.S. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978.

"Outcomes-Based Evaluation: A Working Model for Arts Learning Projects." NEA Grants to Organizations: Outcomes Based Evaluations 13 December 2002 <http://arts.endow.gov/guide/out/faq-al.html>.

Smith, David Andrew. "Covered Wagons of Culture: The Roots and Early History of the National Endowment for the Arts." Diss. U of Missouri, 2000.

Spellman, A.B. Personal Interview. 25 September 2002.

United States. National Endowment for the Arts. Creative Communities: A Challenge America Leadership Initiative. Application Guidelines FY 2001. Washington, DC: NEA, 2001.

---. National Endowment for the Arts Annual Report 1969. Washington, DC: NEA, 1970.

---. National Endowment for the Arts Annual Report 1978. Washington, DC: NEA, 1979

---. National Endowment for the Arts Annual Report 1979. Washington, DC: NEA, 1980.

---. National Endowment for the Arts Annual Report 1990. Washington, DC: NEA, 1991.

Weitz, Judith. Coming Up Taller: Arts and Humanities Programs for Children and Youth at Risk. Washington, DC: President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities, 1996.

WestEd. "Supporting 21st Century Community Learning Centers." R & D Alert. Spring 2000.

Wyszomirski, Margaret J. "Controversies in Arts Policymaking." Public Policy and the Arts. Westview Special Studies in Public Policy and Public Systems Management. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1982.

ATTN: PAULA BRUCE

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: Who Owns the Glass Slipper? Transformation Ideology in Community Drama with Youth | CS512476 |
| Author(s): Lori L. Hager | |
| Corporate Source: | Publication Date: |

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

| The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents |
|---|---|---|
| PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>1 | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>2A | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>2B |
| **Level 1** ☒ | **Level 2A** ☐ | **Level 2B** ☐ |
| Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy. | Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only | Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only |

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, → please**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Signature: [signature] | Printed Name/Position/Title: Lori L. Hager, Ph.D. Youth Arts Consultant | |
| Organization/Address: 4242 N 11th St Phoenix, AZ 85014 | Telephone: | FAX: |
| | E-Mail Address: lori.hager@asu.edu | Date: 2/20/2004 |

## III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| |
|---|
| Publisher/Distributor: |
| Address: |
| Price: |

## IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|---|
| Name: |
| Address: |

## V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

| |
|---|
| Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: |

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**
**4483-A Forbes Boulevard**
**Lanham, Maryland 20706**

**Telephone:** 301-552-4200
**Toll Free:** 800-799-3742
**FAX:** 301-552-4700
**e-mail:** info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
**WWW:** http://ericfacility.org